



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,850	11/25/2003	Nimrod Megiddo	ARC920030085US1	6569

7590 09/29/2008  
Frederick W. Gibb, III  
McGinn & Gibb, PLLC  
Suite 304  
2568-A Riva Road  
Annapolis, MD 21401

EXAMINER
----------

WU, JUNCHUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2191

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/29/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/723,850	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MEGIDDO, NIMROD	
	<b>Examiner</b> JUNCHUN WU	<b>Art Unit</b> 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-8,11-13,17-19,23 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-8,11-13,17-19,23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2191

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on June 11, 2008.
2. Claims 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 17, 18, 23, and 24 have been amended
3. Claims 1, 5-8, 11-13, 17-19, 23 and 24 are pending in this application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polak (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,627 B1 hereinafter "Polak"), in view of Li (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,500 B1 hereinafter "Li").

Per claims 1 and 13

Polak discloses

A method of instructing a computer program to self-optimize, said method comprising:

- inputting a selection command that selects one function from a list of pre-selected functions for input into said computer program at a point of choice determined by a programmer (col.7 lines 54-57 "*If multiple actions are enabled, the dependency action system uses a selection rule to determine which of the enabled actions is to be executed. It is possible to use a selection rule based on random choice.*").

Art Unit: 2191

- allowing a learning protocol in said computer program to track and reward said one function that is selected and to determine an approximate optimal policy of choice of operation of said computer program based on said selection command (col.8 lines 49-57 *“An enabled action selection rule is used to select one of several enabled actions for execution. Different selection rules can be used, including a trivial selection rule that picks one of the enabled actions at random. This invention specifies an enabled action preference policy that is described below with respect to FIG. 13.”*).

But Polak does not disclose

- each function from said list of pre- selected functions is associated with a reward

However, Li explicitly discloses

- wherein each function from said list of pre- selected functions is associated with a reward (col.16 lines 5-9 *“the computer can also provide multiple choices of simple reward-risk choices from the highly efficient experiments for the manager to select to decide, e.g., whether to continue the next self-optimizing cycle.”*).
- Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teaching of Polak with the teachings of Li to include each function from said list of pre- selected functions is associated with a reward in order to provide a self-optimizing machine or method to generate computer code in real time into the computer-generated knowledge bases.

Per claims 5, 17 (Currently Amended)

the rejection of claims 1 and 13 are incorporated respectively and Li further discloses

Art Unit: 2191

- comprising inputting a rule command that establishes a rule for said computer program on how to determine said approximate optimal choice of operation (col.16 lines 55-57 *“self-optimizing machine readily and automatically generates these and other similar rules in computer-coded form ready for use as instant machine expert systems...”*).

Per claims 6, 18 (Currently Amended)

the rejection of claims 1 and 13 are incorporated and Li further discloses

- comprising inputting a reward command that provides a reward, at a point of choice, determined by a programmer, in said computer program, for said one function selected by said selection command, which results in said approximate optimal choice for self-optimizing said computer program (col.16 lines 5-9 *“the computer can also provide multiple choices of simple reward-risk choices from the highly efficient experiments for the manager to select to decide, e.g., whether to continue the next self-optimizing cycle.”*).

Per claim 7

Polak discloses

A method of optimizing a computer program, said method comprising:

- specifying at least one point of choice, determined by a programmer, in said computer program (col.8 lines 11-15 *“This invention preferably uses a specific type of selection rule, called a preference policy, that is based on a preference relation that specifies if one action is to be preferred over another action”*).

Art Unit: 2191

- defining a set of alternate choices at each point of choice ([Abstract] “*if one action fails to produce a value to a storage location, other alternative actions may still be enabled and can be executed.*”), wherein said set of alternate choices include operational choices comprises:
- inputting a selection command that selects one function from a list of pre-selected functions into said computer program (col.7 lines 54-57 “*If multiple actions are enabled, the dependency action system uses a selection rule to determine which of the enabled actions is to be executed. It is possible to use a selection rule based on random choice.*”)
- allowing a learning protocol in said computer program to track and reward said one function that is selected to determine an approximate optimal operation of said computer program based on said selection command (col.8 lines 49-57 “*An enabled action selection rule is used to select one of several enabled actions for execution. Different selection rules can be used, including a trivial selection rule that picks one of the enabled actions at random. This invention specifies an enabled action preference policy that is described below with respect to FIG. 13.*”).

But Polak does not disclose

- setting at least one feedback point for each point of choice and each function from said list of pre-selected functions is associated with a reward.

However, Li discloses

- setting at least one feedback point for each point of choice (col.4 lines 46-52 “*An additional object of the invention is to provide self-optimizing machine and method which actively computes, and automatically sets at, the instantaneous optimal combinations of*

Art Unit: 2191

*the many relevant variables in various categories, with instant feed-back to supply data for immediate replanning, retesting, and reoptimizing”).*

- wherein each function from said list of pre-selected functions is associated with a reward (col.16 lines 5-9 “*the computer can also provide multiple choices of simple reward-risk choices from the highly efficient experiments for the manager to select to decide, e.g., whether to continue the next self-optimizing cycle.*”).
- Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teaching of Polak with the teachings of Li to include foregoing descriptions in order to provide a self-optimizing machine or method to generate computer code in real time into the computer-generated knowledge bases.

Per claim 8 (Currently Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Polak further discloses

comprising allowing a learning protocol in said computer program to determine an approximate optimal operation of said computer program based on said specifying (col.8 lines 11-12 “*This invention preferably uses a specific type of selection rule, called a preference policy*”, defining (col.5 lines 59-64 “*...The actions 20 define the functional components of the dependency action system in terms of the data that is required and the data that is produced.*”, and setting (col.13 lines 13-15 “*The dependency action system control routine begins in step S1000. Control then continues to steps 1100, where the dependency action system is initialized by setting all storage locations to "empty".*”).

Art Unit: 2191

Per claim 11 (Currently Amended)

the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and Polak further discloses

set of alternate choices include operational choices, further comprising:

- inputting a rule command into said computer program, wherein said rule command establishes a rule on how to determine said approximate optimal operation (col.8 lines 11-15 *“This invention preferably uses a specific type of selection rule, called a preference policy, that is based on a preference relation that specifies if one action is to be preferred over another action”*).

Per claim 12 (Currently Amended)

the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and Li further discloses

set of alternate choices include operational choices, and wherein said method further comprises:

- inputting a reward command into said computer program at a point of choice, determined by a programmer, wherein said reward command provides reward in said computer program, which results in said approximate optimal choice for optimizing said computer program (col.16 lines 5-9 *“the computer can also provide multiple choices of simple reward-risk choices from the highly efficient experiments for the manager to select to decide, e.g., whether to continue the next self-optimizing cycle.”*).

6. Claims 19, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polak, in view of Li and further view of Christensen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,333,304 A1 hereinafter “Christensen”).



Art Unit: 2191

Per claim 19

Polak discloses

A computer system comprising:

- Processor adapted to execute a learning protocol in said computer program to track and reward said one function that is selected and determine an approximate optimal operation of said computer program based on at least said selection command (col.8 lines 49-57 *“An enabled action selection rule is used to select one of several enabled actions for execution. Different selection rules can be used, including a trivial selection rule that picks one of the enabled actions at random. This invention specifies an enabled action preference policy that is described below with respect to FIG. 13.”*).

Li discloses

- wherein each function from said list of pre-selected functions is associated with a reward (col.16 lines 5-9 *“the computer can also provide multiple choices of simple reward-risk choices from the highly efficient experiments for the manager to select to decide, e.g., whether to continue the next self-optimizing cycle.”*).

But both Polak and Li do not disclose

- a pre-compiler that inputs a selection command at a point of choice, determined by a programmer, into a computer program that runs a computer, said selection command selecting one function from a list of pre-selected functions for input into said computer program.

However, Christensen discloses

Art Unit: 2191

- a pre-compiler that inputs a selection command at a point of choice, determined by a programmer, into a computer program that runs a computer, said selection command selecting one function from a list of pre-selected functions for input into said computer program (col.2 lines 16-26 “*A software application to be evaluated is compiled utilizing a compiler application which inserts at least one prelude routine command during compiling which is utilized to invoke the prelude routine utilized upon each entry to a procedure within the software application. A command invoking the evaluation function is inserted into the prelude routine such that each entry to a procedure within the software application under evaluation will result in the storage of execution information at that point. ”*”).
- Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teachings of Polak and Li and further include a pre-compiler that inputs a selection command at a point of choice, determined by a programmer, into a computer program that runs a computer, said selection command selecting one function from a list of pre-selected functions for input into said computer program by the teachings of Christensen in order to provide a method for evaluating software application performance utilization a compiler application ([abstract]).

Per claim 23 (Currently Amended)

the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated Li further discloses

- input a rule command into said computer program that runs on said computer, said rule command established a rule for said computer program on how to determine said

Art Unit: 2191

approximate optimal choice of operation (col.16 lines 55-57 “*self-optimizing machine readily and automatically generates these and other similar rules in computer-coded form ready for use as instant machine expert systems...*”).

Per claim 24 (Currently Amended)

the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated Li further discloses

- input a reward command that provides a reward, at a point of choice in said computer program which runs on said computer, for said one function selected by said selection command, which results in said approximate optimal choice for self- optimizing said computer program (col.16 lines 5-9 “*the computer can also provide multiple choices of simple reward-risk choices from the highly efficient experiments for the manager to select to decide, e.g., whether to continue the next self-optimizing cycle.*”).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant’s arguments filed on June 11, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the remarks, Applicant argues that:
  - (a) Applicant respectfully submitted a rule 131 declaration swearing behind the prior art Lewis.

### **Examiner’s response:**

- (a) Examiner uses Polak reference as prior art combining Li or/and Christensen against the applicant’s claimed invention, as applied hereto.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junchun Wu whose telephone number is 571-270-1250. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-17:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.<sup>1</sup>

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JW

/Wei Y Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191

---

<sup>1</sup>